

## CHAPTER 5 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is a description of the public outreach and participation opportunities made available through the development of the draft RMP/EIS and the coordination and consultation efforts to date with tribes, government agencies, and other stakeholders. It includes a list of preparers of the document and the agencies, organizations, and individuals that received a copy of the draft RMP/EIS for review. There have been and will continue to be many ways for the public to participate in the planning process for public lands under the jurisdiction of the CdA FO.

### 5.2 PUBLIC COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH

#### 5.2.1 Scoping Process

Scoping for the RMP/EIS began on September 3, 2004. Scoping is the term used in the CEQ Regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500 et seq.) to define the early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in the planning process. The scoping process provides an avenue to involve the public in identifying significant issues related to potential land use management actions. The process also helps identify any issues that are not significant and that can thereby be eliminated from detailed analysis. The list of stakeholders and other interested parties is also confirmed and augmented during the scoping process.

##### 5.2.1.1 Distribution List

The BLM prepared a newsletter detailing the scoping process and project issues and mailed them to just over 200 federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the public whose names were compiled from data kept by the CdA FO. The BLM updated the distribution list throughout the development of the RMP/EIS. The distribution list of the agencies, organizations, and individuals who have been a part of the RMP/EIS process is available in the administrative record. The BLM sent each of these groups or individuals a notice of availability and, upon request, the individuals were sent either the summary of the draft RMP/EIS, the entire document, or the location of the Web site where the document may be viewed. The CdA FO maintains the distribution list, which is available on request.

##### 5.2.1.2 Notice of Intent

The NOI is the legal document notifying the public of the BLM's intent to initiate the planning process and to prepare an EIS for a major federal action. The NOI invites the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public in determining the scope and significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. The NOI for the CdA RMP was published in the *Federal Register* on September 3, 2004. The scoping period for receipt of public comments ended on November 15, 2004.

##### 5.2.1.3 Press Releases

Local and regional newspapers and radio stations throughout the planning area were used to disseminate information on the CdA RMP scoping and planning process. The BLM prepared press releases and print advertisements announcing the official scoping meetings and inviting the public to provide input. The releases, mailed mid-October 2004, were newspaper advertisements and were provided to the following print and broadcast media:

## 5. Consultation and Coordination

NEWSPAPERS	
Print Advertisement	General Press Release
<i>Coeur d'Alene Press</i> (Coeur d'Alene): October 8, 10, and 17, 2004	<i>Spokesman Review</i> (including the eastern Washington and northern Idaho editions)
<i>Spokesman Review</i> (Coeur d'Alene and Spokane, Washington): October 8, 10, and 18, 2004	<i>Coeur d'Alene Press</i> (including its affiliate northern Idaho papers)
<i>Nickel's Worth</i> (Coeur d'Alene): week of October 7, 2004	
<i>St. Maries Gazette</i> (St. Maries): October 17, 2004	
RADIO	
Bonnors Ferry, KBFI-AM 1450	Oldtown, KMJY-AM 700
Osburn, KWAL-AM 620	Coeur d'Alene, KVNI-AM 1080

### 5.2.1.4 Public Scoping Notice and Planning Criteria

The BLM prepared an initial newsletter regarding the CdA RMP project and mailed it on September 30, 2004. The BLM also made the scoping letter and briefing package available for public view on the Internet that same month.

The initial newsletter provided information on the public scoping process and the scheduled open house scoping meetings and background information on the purpose and need for the planning activity and identified need for change topics. Preliminary resource issues were identified and summarized, and preliminary planning criteria were also included. These serve as ground rules for the planning process and ensure that efforts are tailored to pertinent issues that will lead to the development of alternatives.

The notice invited the public to participate in the scoping process, to further develop issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP based on the need for change topics, and to provide comment on the planning criteria. The newsletter included mailing and e-mail addresses to send comments to. The mailing list was compiled from data kept by the CdA FO staff and included over 200 entries.

### 5.2.1.5 Scoping Meetings

The BLM held public scoping meetings in Bonners Ferry on October 13, in St. Maries on October 14, in Sandpoint on October 20, in Coeur d'Alene on October 21, and in Wallace on October 25, 2004. The BLM provided the local media listed in the table above with press releases and people listed on the individual mailing list with newsletters announcing the time, location, and purpose of these meetings.

The format for the scoping meetings featured informal one-on-one presentations by interdisciplinary team members. Attendees signed a registration sheet as they entered, then team members escorted them to stations set up around the room, detailing the proposed action, resource issues, planning criteria, and a proposed schedule for completing the planning process. GIS inventory maps at stations highlighted various resources.

Following presentations, attendees were encouraged to mail in written comments and questions or to fill out comment cards specific to the CdA RMP. Copies of the initial newsletter were also made available at the comment table.

## 5.2.2 Project Web Site

The BLM maintains an interactive project Web site (<http://www.blm.gov/rmp/id/cda>) to communicate with the public, collaborators, and BLM employees on the RMP/EIS process. The official Web site went online in September 2004, serving as a clearinghouse for project information. Materials on the Web site include such information as notices and general news regarding the project, the RMP/EIS, and meeting schedules, documents to be reviewed and commented on, and frequently asked questions and answers. Maps and photos

showing the planning area, appropriate land status, towns, rivers, highways, and other BLM-approved features are also posted. The BLM continuously updates the Web site with information, documents, and announcements.

### 5.2.3 Newsletters

Newsletters are published throughout the course of the RMP/EIS process and are posted on the BLM Web site. Participants also may request to receive newsletters through e-mail. The newsletters remind the public of how they can comment and get involved and include a calendar of events. Each edition addresses in detail issues of concern identified during the scoping process. The first newsletter was mailed on September 30, 2004. Newsletters to county commissioners and tribal representatives are mailed, with cover letters addressed to specific individuals. Additional newsletters were published at major project milestones and mailed to individuals and organizations on the project mailing list. This mailing list was updated following the scoping process based on requests from individuals wishing to be added to or removed from the list. All individuals who participated in the scoping meetings or who submitted a comment were also added to the list unless they opted out of receiving future distributions. The database has been periodically updated to allow BLM to reach as many people as possible.

## 5.3 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The CdA RMP will provide guidance for a vast area of public land in northern Idaho and necessarily requires the coordination of a wide variety of organizations with interests in the area. Among those are governmental bodies that create, administer, and monitor policy for these, as well as adjacent, lands.

In January 2005, the BLM met with several interested state agencies to finalize partnering opportunities based on the level of vested interest these organizations have in the RMP planning process.

The benefits of enhanced collaboration among agencies in the preparation of NEPA analyses include disclosing relevant information early in the analytical process; applying available technical expertise and staff support; avoiding duplication with other federal, state, tribal, and local procedures; and establishing a mechanism for addressing intergovernmental issues.

To initiate the collaborative planning process, early in the scoping period, over 200 individuals from the public, agencies, and organizations were mailed newsletters. The newsletter introduced the BLM and the RMP planning process; provided the preliminary issues, planning criteria, and project milestones timeline; and suggested methods for public involvement. The newsletter also provided the prospective dates and venues for the five scoping meetings.

The BLM invited the following to become cooperating agencies:

- Boards of commissioners from the five counties in the planning area;
- Four Native American tribes with treaty, trust, or historical ties to the planning area;
- The Governor of the state of Idaho and six state agencies:
  - Idaho Department of Fish and Game
  - Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation
  - Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

## *5. Consultation and Coordination*

- Idaho Department of Lands
- Idaho Department of Commerce, Tourism Division
- Idaho Department of Agriculture

None of these organizations were able to commit the resources necessary for formal cooperating agency status. However, some have participated less formally, as described later in this section. BLM also invited the Idaho Panhandle National Forests and the US Environmental Protection Agency to collaborate in the planning process.

Additionally, the BLM mailed letters inviting the following federal, state, local, and tribal organizations to the five scoping meetings held October 13 through October 25, 2004.

- Coeur d'Alene Tribe
- Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
- Kalispel Tribe
- Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
- Benewah County Board of Commissioners
- Bonner County Board of Commissioners
- Boundary County Board of Commissioners
- Kootenai County Board of Commissioners
- Shoshone County Board of Commissioners
- Coeur d'Alene Area Chamber of Commerce
- Kellogg Chamber of Commerce
- Priest River Chamber of Commerce
- Saint Maries Chamber of Commerce
- Sandpoint Chamber of Commerce
- Spokane Chamber of Commerce
- Spokane Valley Chamber of Commerce

In addition to public scoping and agency and tribal consultation, the BLM spoke with individuals from the public and met with several local representatives and organizations, including the BLM Coeur d'Alene District Resource Advisory Council (RAC). In September and October 2004, BLM CdA staff either conducted teleconference or personal meetings with the Blue Ribbon Coalition, Bonner County Commissioners, and the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative. Discussions focused on the following issues:

- OHV use and travel management.

- Use of public land on Gold Mountain as a communication site for Bonner County emergency communications.
- Potential for the BLM to provide additional recreational access to Lake Pend Oreille.
- Concerns regarding Sandpoint's municipal watershed and BLM-managed land (21 percent of the watershed area) within the watershed and some of the protection efforts that may be incorporated into the RMP.
- BLM's fuel reduction and wildland-urban interface (WUI) efforts and programs.
- Stewardship projects.
- Land tenure and exchanges.

The BLM sponsored a Community Economic Profile Workshop on January 26, 2005, in Bonner County. The purpose of this workshop was to assist northern Idaho communities to develop economic vision and goals, and then generated ideas for how BLM management of public lands could help achieve these goals. All public, agency, and tribal members were invited. An announcement was posted on the project Web site, and a notice was published in relevant newspapers. A report summarizing the outcomes of the workshop is published on the BLM RMP Web site and is discussed in a separate socioeconomic report prepared by the BLM (BLM 2005b).

All of the organizations that BLM initially invited to participate in the planning process (listed above) were also invited to participate in alternative development. Chapter 2 contains more detailed information on alternative development.

The following describes the BLM's consultation and coordination efforts during the preparation of this draft RMP/EIS. Consultation is an ongoing effort throughout the entire process of developing the final RMP/EIS.

### 5.3.1 Native American Tribes

To initiate tribal consultation for the CdA RMP planning process, the BLM mailed out three initial letters to each of the four tribes within the planning area (Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes), as follows:

- On August 17, 2004, the BLM mailed out letters to each of the four tribes within the CdA FO planning area notifying them that the RMP development process had been initiated and inviting them to participate.
- Each of these tribes was later invited to the BLM Planning Concepts Training held in September 2004 via a letter mailed out August 27, 2004.
- The tribes were also provided invitations, dated October 4, 2004, to the five public meetings held October 13 through October 25, 2004, with an enclosed copy of the initial newsletter.

The Coeur d'Alene Tribe is a participating agency with whom the BLM collaborated in developing the RMP. The BLM CdA District Cultural Resource Specialist met with the representatives of the Tribe to discuss the RMP and issues of concern for the tribe.

Prior to public scoping, the BLM Cultural Resource Specialist met with the Cultural Director, Archaeologist, and GIS Specialist of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe on November 30, 2004, to offer information on developing the CdA RMP and to solicit input. The tribe's Cultural Director, Mr. Quanah Matheson, had submitted a letter to BLM prior to their meeting. This letter outlined the tribe's concerns regarding the RMP/EIS. The group

## 5. Consultation and Coordination

discussed the issues and clarified those issues in the letter so the BLM could better address allocations and conflicts within the RMP process. Some of the issues raised included the following:

- Management of a known Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) and possible buffer zone as it pertains to potential direct effects or visual effects from activities.
- Confidentiality of archeological sites or TCPs.
- Effects on tribal uses as a result of the BLM land tenure program.
- Request for future consultations to commence with a letter to the Tribe asking for any information regarding archeological sites or TCPs that may be affected.
- Impacts to botanical resources that may be important to the Tribe.
- Potential effects on Native American use on BLM lands within the traditional use areas.

On June 20, 2006, the Coeur d'Alene Field Manager and several members of the CdA FO staff met with members of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe's Natural Resources Departments. The meeting included a presentation on the Draft RMP/EIS by BLM, and a discussion of the Tribe's concerns regarding the plan. On June 27, BLM also met with the Tribe's cultural resource staff to discuss their concerns.

### 5.3.2 Federal and State Agencies

Although the CdA FO invited six Idaho state agencies to participate as cooperating agencies, none of these agencies committed to this formal status. However, the CdA FO has and will continue to involve them in the planning process. Because the US Forest Service manages approximately 5 million acres of land in the CdA FO planning area and is in the process of revising their land use plan, many issues coincide with BLM efforts. For this reason, the agencies have been in close collaboration. As the Public Affairs officer of the Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF), Ms. Jodi Kramer represented the USFS in the scoping process and attended the BLM's Planning Concepts Training held in Coeur d'Alene on September 14-16, 2004. She provided information and results from the IPNF's own extended scoping process associated with the revision of the forest's land use plan. Some of the overlapping concerns disclosed by the public regarding National Forest lands that could also apply to BLM-administered lands within the CdA FO were recorded in the RMP Scoping Summary Report (BLM 2005k).

Some of the overlapping concerns regarding National Forest lands that could also apply to BLM-administered lands within the planning area include the following:

- The plan should make a fair evaluation of all sources and uses that contribute to the spread of noxious weeds.
- In bull trout areas, suggestions were made for permitting helicopter logging only, placing 300-foot buffers around riparian areas, restricting OHVs and snowmobiles to ridges only, and not allowing water crossings or trails on slopes of watersheds.
- Habitat protection measures should be implemented to maintain viable and diverse animal populations, and not just focus on particular managed species.
- Habitat connectivity should be an important component for habitat protection in key wildlife areas.
- Travel plan should assess the need for individual road closures and address user conflicts.

BLM began informal consultation with USFWS on the RMP in June of 2005. FWS provided input to the development of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) and signed a memorandum of agreement outlining the consultation process. BLM then prepared a Draft Biological Assessment (BA) on the Draft Preferred Alternative. As a result of discussions with FWS on the Draft BA, BLM made changes to the Preferred Alternative, which appear in the Special Status Species section of the Proposed RMP/EIS. Upon completion of the BA, BLM initiated formal consultation. FWS is currently developing a biological opinion.

During the public comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS, BLM discussed the document and state agency concerns during a meeting with Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, and a phone conversation with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

### 5.3.3 Resource Advisory Council

The BLM Coeur d'Alene District Resource Advisory Council (RAC) is made up of 15 citizen members. The purpose of the RAC is to provide northern Idaho citizens with an opportunity to counsel and advise the Coeur d'Alene and Cottonwood Field Offices in the planning and management of BLM-administered public lands. Membership includes a cross section of Idaho residents who are representative of the interests of the following three general groups:

- 1) Persons who hold federal grazing permits or leases within the area for which the council is organized; who represent interests associated with transportation or rights-of-way; who represent outdoor recreation, off-highway vehicle users, or commercial recreation activities; who represent the commercial timber industry; or who represent energy and mineral development;
- 2) Persons representing nationally or regionally recognized environmental organizations, dispersed recreation activities, archaeological and historical interests, or nationally or regionally recognized wild horse and burro interest groups; and
- 3) Persons who hold state, county, or local elected office; who are employed by a state agency responsible for managing natural resources, land, or water; who represent Indian tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the council is organized; who are employed as academicians in natural resource management or the natural sciences; or who represent the affected public-at-large.

Vacancies currently exist for an environmental representative and an at-large representative.

RAC members serve without salary and are selected for their ability to provide informed, objective advice on a variety of public land issues, and their commitment to collaboration in seeking solutions to those issues. Members are appointed to serve 3-year terms on a staggered basis. This means that one-third of the RAC is subject to appointment or reappointment each year.

The RAC began their involvement in the RMP/EIS process beginning in December 2004. The RAC formed two subgroups; one to work with CdA FO RMP, and the other to work with Cottonwood FO RMP. The RAC subgroup for CdA FO provided suggestions for the Scoping Report and identification of the planning issues. They were also involved with alternative development (see Chapter 2). During the public comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS, BLM gave a presentation on the document to the District RAC and discussed their concerns.

## 5.4 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

On January 13, 2006, paper or electronic (CD-ROM) copies of the Draft RMP/EIS were distributed to a total of 130 parties, including elected officials, regulatory agencies, members of the RAC, and other members of

## 5. Consultation and Coordination

the public. Included in all mailings were instructions on how to provide written comments by the April 14, 2006, deadline. Also on January 13, 2006, the availability of the document was announced in the *Federal Register*, which initiated the 90-day public comment period.

In addition, approximately 350 parties were notified of the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS via a directed mailing of the project newsletter. Recipients of newsletters included federal, state, and local elected officials, federally recognized Tribes, agency representatives, property owners near the CdA FO, individuals, special interest groups, organizations, all members of the RAC, and all persons who had written, faxed, or sent e-mails to express their interest in participating in the project, or those who attended and signed in at the public scoping meetings.

Beginning on its issuance on January 13, 2006, the Draft RMP/EIS was available for downloading on the project Web site. Following is a list of the public libraries where the Draft RMP/EIS was also available for review and photocopying in and around the planning area:

- Boundary County Public Library (Bonners Ferry)
- Coeur d'Alene Public Library
- Hayden Regional Library
- Kellogg Public Library
- Mullan Public Library
- North Idaho College Library (Coeur d'Alene)
- Osburn Public Library
- Pinehurst-Kingston Library
- Plummer Public Library
- Post Falls Public Library
- Sandpoint Library
- Spokane Public Library (Main Branch)
- Spokane County Library (Spokane Valley)
- St. Maries Public Library
- Wallace Public Library

Paper or CD-ROM copies of the Draft RMP/EIS also were available by request to the BLM in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

### 5.5 ADVERTISEMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

In addition to the newsletters, newspaper advertisements and a press release were issued to notify the public of the Draft RMP/EIS availability, to announce the three open houses, and to request public comments. A press release was issued to approximately 23 media points on January 13, 2006. Display advertisements were published in the *Nicklesworth* (February 2, 2006), *St. Maries Gazette Record* (February 1, 2006), *Bonner County Daily Bee* (February 7 and 8, 2006), *Shoshone News-Press* (February 5 and 7, 2006), *Spokesman Review* (February 5 and 7, 2006), *Coeur d'Alene Press* (February 5 and 7, 2006), and *Bonner's Ferry Herald* (February 2, 2006). Another



news release reminding the public of the public comment process and comment timeline was sent to the same newspapers on March 27, 2006.

## 5.6 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public meetings were held in three northern Idaho locations in the vicinity of the project planning area during the 90-day public review period of the Draft RMP/EIS (Table 5-1). Each public meeting featured displays, maps, and an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists who provided information and answered questions. Each public meeting also included a brief presentation on the Draft RMP/EIS.

<b>Table 5-1 Public Meeting Schedule and Attendance</b>				
<b>Venue</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Wallace Best Western Inn	Wallace, ID	February 7, 2006	7:00 PM – 9:00 PM	21
Shilo Inn	Coeur d’Alene, ID	February 8, 2006	7:00 PM – 9:00 PM	20
Sandpoint Community Hall	Sandpoint, ID	February 9, 2006	7:00 PM – 9:00 PM	10
<b>Total</b>				<b>51</b>

## 5.7 METHOD OF COMMENT COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Methods of submitting comments included letters, facsimiles, and electronic mail messages. Official comments consist only of those submitted in written form; no verbal testimony was collected as official comments, and all individuals were encouraged to submit comments in writing.

To ensure that public comments were properly registered and that none were overlooked, a two-part management and tracking system was adopted. This system involved registering each author’s name on a list and then tracking all individual comments within each submission for analysis.

All submissions were made available for public review at the BLM Coeur d’Alene Field Office. The Web site submission instructions and newsletter provided instructions on requesting the confidentiality of individual respondents, and how to withhold individual names or addresses from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

After written submissions were entered in a tracking list, all then were read and evaluated to determine their content. Most submissions contained several individual comments pointing to one opportunity or issue; thus, it was necessary to develop a method to systematically track all individual comments received. This was accomplished through a system in which individual comments within a longer letter or comment form were numbered for tracking purposes. Individual comments were tallied and analyzed, and written submissions were registered in the administrative record.

## 5.8 COMMENTS RECEIVED

A total of 68 written submissions were received in the form of electronic mail messages, letters, and facsimiles. Most of the submissions had multiple comments relating to a variety of resource topics, and there were 698 individual comments. Those topics that generated the most comments were Recreation, with 334 comments, and OHV use, with 324 comments. Please see Appendix K for a comment index, a list of commentors, and all comments and responses.

## 5. Consultation and Coordination

### 5.9 LIST OF PREPARERS

An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from the BLM Coeur d'Alene Field Office prepared this RMP/EIS (Table 5-2). Tetra Tech, Inc. held primary responsibility for preparing the Executive Summary and Chapters 1-3, and 5, References, and Appendices. BLM held the primary responsibility for preparing Chapter 4 with some technical assistance from Tetra Tech.

<b>Table 5-2 RMP/EIS Preparers</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
<i><b>BLM – Coeur d'Alene Field Office</b></i>			
Scott Pavey	5	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, RMP Project Manager	MS/Forest Resources BS/Biology
Jeff Casey	17	Fire Use Specialist	BS/Range and Animal Science
Bill Cook	29	Natural Resource Specialist	MS/Forest Resources BS/Forest Management
LeAnn (Eno) Abell	17	Botanist	BS/Biology Graduate work Botany and Plant Ecology
Doug Evans	11	Biological Science Technician-Weeds	Graduate Work-Plant Ecology BS/Botany
Scott Forssell	18	Realty Specialist	MS/Natural Resource Management BS/Recreation Management
David Fortier	37	Environmental Engineer/Public Health and Safety –Abandoned Mine Lands/Hazardous Materials)	Post Grad Work 3 years MS/Civil Engineering BS/Civil Engineering
Dean Huibregtse	26	Rangeland Management Specialist	BS/Range/Wildlife
Terry Kincaid	34	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BS/Park and Recreation Resources
Howard E. Merriman, Jr.	20	Supervisory GIS Specialist	BS/Industrial Engineering Minors/Business Administration, Economics and Mathematics
Mark Reeves	35	Area Forester	BS/Forest Management
Scott R. Robinson	32	Wildlife Biologist	BS/Wildlife Management
Scott Sanner	15	Mining Engineer	BS/Mining Engineering
David Sisson	28	Archaeologist	MA/Interdisciplinary Studies (MAIS) BS/Anthropology
Mike Stevenson	19	Hydrologist	BS/Geology
Gregory S. Thorhaug	5	GIS Specialist	BS/Engineering – Geological Sciences
Brad C. Wagner	24	Range Technician/Fuels	BS/Physical Education & History
Cindy Weston	13	Resource Coordinator/Fisheries Biologist	MS/Biology (aquatic emphasis) BS/Biology
Mindy Wright	7	Cartographic Technician	BS/Education/Math GIS certificate

**Table 5-2 RMP/EIS Preparers**

Name	Years of Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
<i>Contractor – Tetra Tech, Inc.</i>			
David Batts	14	Principal-in-Charge, QA/QC	MS/Natural Resource Planning BS/International Development
David Munro	10	Project Manager, Vegetation, Riparian and Wetlands, Invasive and Noxious Weeds	MA/Natural Resource Management BA/Psychology
David Kane	20	Wildlife, Special Status Species, Vegetation, Grazing	PhD/Ecology and Conservation Biology (Grasslands) BS/Wildlife Conservation and Management
Summer Adamietz	7	Recreation, Transportation and Travel	MUP/Land Use Planning BS/Geography and Planning/Biology
Wynn Bruce	21	Air Quality	MS/Meteorology
Connie Callahan	12	Lands and Realty, QA/QC	JD/Environmental Law BA/Anthropology
Kevin Doyle	20	Cultural Resources, Indian Trust, Paleontological Resources	BA/Sociology Continuing Studies in Anthropology, Historic Preservation, and Cultural Resource Management
Cameo Flood	19	Forests, Forest Projects, Fire	BS/Forestry
Andrew Gentile	6	Renewable Energy	MS/Environmental Management BS/Biochemistry
Derek Holmgren	7	Visual Resources, Special Designations	MS/Environmental Science BA/International Studies BS/Environmental Science
Genevieve Kaiser	15	GIS, Socioeconomics, Renewable Energy	MS/Energy Management BA/Economics GIS Certificate/University of Denver
Erin King, RPA	6	Socioeconomics, Tribal Trust, Cultural Resources	MA/Cultural Anthropology, Public Archaeology BA/Cultural Anthropology
Mike Manka	11	Fisheries, Special Status Fish, Wild and Scenic Rivers	BS/Biological Sciences, Ecology and Systematics
Craig Miller	13	Terrestrial Wildlife, Special Status Terrestrial and Plant Species	MS/Wildlife Biology BS/Wildlife and Fisheries Biology
Angie Nelson	10	QA/QC	BA/Biology, English Minor
Stephanie Phippen	7	Soils, Geology, Minerals	MS/Geology/Watershed Science BA/Geology

## 5. Consultation and Coordination

<b>Table 5-2 RMP/EIS Preparers</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Holly Prohaska	7	Grazing	MS/Environmental Management BA/Marine Science / Biology
Roger Thomas	26	Public Health and Safety, Hazardous Materials, Abandoned Minelands	MS/Psychology with specialization in Chemical and Environmental Toxicology BA/ Psychology
Randolph Varney	15	Technical Editing	MFA/Writing BA/Technical and Professional Writing
Jon Welge	11	Botany, Wetlands, Rangeland	BAE/ Earth Science BA/Physical Geography
Tom Whitehead, RG, CH	16	Water Resources	MS/Hydrology BS/Geology
Ann Zoidis, M.S.	16	QA/QC	MS/Physiology and Behavioral Biology BS/Geology